

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on April 19, 2005. Claims 1-13 are pending in the application with Claims 1, 7 and 13 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended. No new matter or issues are believed to be introduced by the amendments.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-13

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,541 issued to Kamen et al. on May 8, 2001 ("Kamen et al."); Claims 3-5, 9-11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,084,598 issued to Chekerylla on July 4, 2000 ("Chekerylla"); and Claims 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,203 issued to Goldberg et al. on October 5, 1999 ("Goldberg et al.").

Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 in an effort to better define Applicant's invention and to overcome the rejections cited above.

Amended Claim 1 recites:

A method for providing and processing a cursored user interaction with a spatially displayed medical image and performing image processing on said medical image, wherein said method comprises the steps of:

providing a menu-less graphical interface having a plurality of sensitive areas, each sensitive area is positioned at a predetermined, fixed relative position with respect to an associated medical image display field and with respect to at least one additional sensitive area, wherein each of the plurality of sensitive areas corresponds to at least one function and is associated with one of a plurality of different cursors providing a visual cue as to the at least one function corresponding to each of the plurality of sensitive areas; and controlling a mouse

configured such that positionings of said mouse within each of said plurality of sensitive areas causes display of one of the plurality of different cursors and allows activation and control of a plurality of processing functionalities for performing the at least one function respectively associated with each of said plurality of sensitive areas.” (Emphasis added).

Claims 7 and 13 recite the same limitations as the limitations added to Claim 1.

Support for the newly added claim limitations can be found at Applicant’s written description at page 4, lines 20-21 and throughout the various figures.

Kamen et al. is directed to the use of templates on a screen. Each template is associated with a process or link which can be invoked by moving a cursor to the area on the screen represented by the particular template which corresponds to the process or link which is desired to be invoked. In a particular embodiment, when the cursor is moved to one of the regions corresponding to a template, the cursor changes appearance. As such, according to Kamen et al. “a user can determine whether cursor 8 is located in an active region by observing the appearance of cursor 8.”

Kamen et al. does not disclose or suggest that the appearance of the cursor provides additional information to the user, such as a visual cue as to at least one function corresponding to a particular template. Chekerylla, Goldberg et al. and the combination thereof also does not disclose or suggest such a feature. That is, none of the cited references disclose or suggest “wherein each of the plurality of sensitive areas corresponds to at least one function and is associated with one of a plurality of different cursors providing a visual cue as to the at least one function corresponding to each of the plurality of sensitive areas, as recited by Applicant’s independent Claims 1, 7 and 13.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 recite limitations which are patentably distinct over the disclosures of the cited references. Hence, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to Claims 1, 7 and 13 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 and 8-12 depend from Claims 1 and 7, respectively, and therefore include the limitations of Claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, for the same reasons given for Claims 1 and 7, Claims 2-6 and 8-12 are believed to contain patentable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to Claims 2-6 and 8-12 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusions

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-13, are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

Application No.: 09/864,128
Reply to Office Action Dated: April 19, 2005

Atty. Docket: 1320-62 (NL 000279)

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call John Vodopia, Esq., Intellectual Property Counsel, at 914-333-9627.

Respectfully submitted,



George Likourezos
Reg. No. 40,067
Attorney for Applicant

Mailing Address:
Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001